

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the thorough consideration given to the present application in the first Office Action.

By this Response, claims 1, 2, 6, 16, 19 have been amended, claims 4-5, 7-13, 17-18 and 20-23 have been canceled and new claims 24-38 have been added. Thus, claims 1-3, 6, 14-16, 19 and 24-38 are now pending in the application.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

OBJECTIONS TO THE SPECIFICATION

The specification stands objected to as failing to provide the application number for the application referenced in paragraph 0023. In response, Applicant has amended the specification to recite the corresponding application number. The specification was also objected to as failing to provide support for the phrase "extended arm portion" in claims 5, 8, 12 and 18. Claims 5, 8, 12 and 18 have been canceled, thereby rendering this objection moot. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these objections is respectfully requested.

OBJECTIONS TO THE CLAIMS

Claims 1, 4, 13, 16 18, 22 and 23 were objected for certain informalities. Claims 4, 13, 18 and 22-23 have been canceled, thereby rendering the objections to these claims moot. Claim 1 has been amended to correct a typographical error, namely to replace "slide" with "slider." With respect to claim 16, the Examiner contends that the meaning of

the term "structure" was not clear. However, as amended, claim 16 does not recite "structure," thereby rendering this objection moot. In light of the amendments to claims 1 and 16, reconsideration and withdrawal of these objections are respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3, 6, 14-15, 16 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over James et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,412,960) in view of one or more of Hollister (U.S. Pat. No. 1,853,427), Mahaney (U.S. Pat. No. 5,007,258), Leininger et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 4,866,963), Vickers et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,152,497), Yang (U.S. Pat. No. 4,732,417), Dallmann et al., (U.S. Pat. No. 5,301,989) Sullivan et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,742,365 and Litvin (U.S. Pat. No. 5,666,830). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

As amended, independent claim 1 recites a slide lock assembly for an outdoor pedestal closure comprising, among other things, a base connected to a dome of the pedestal closure. The base has an outer surface configured to prevent snagging cables when the cables are installed in the pedestal closure. See, for example, paragraph 0025 of the subject application.

It is well known that such slide lock assemblies are installed within pedestal closures and are typically located adjacent to telecommunication cables housed within the enclosure. As further explained below, none of the references cited by the Patent Office, whether considered alone or together, disclose or suggest a slide lock assembly for an outdoor pedestal closure, where the slide lock assembly comprises a base having

an outer surface configured to prevent snagging cables when the cables are installed in the pedestal closure.

For example, James discloses a lock structure 22 having a web 24 and legs 25. The lock structure 22 also includes a second channel 49 having a web 50 and legs 51 and 51'. The lock structure 22, as shown in figures 2, 3 and 4, is not configured to prevent any sort of snagging because the web 50 and the legs 51 and 51' define sharp edges that would snag cables.

Hollister also fails to disclose a base having an outer surface configured to prevent snagging cables. In fact, Hollister does not even disclose a lock for a pedestal closure. Instead, Hollister discloses a tank cap lock for an automobile. The cap includes a lock body 11 that is mounted against an inner side of a plate P. See lines 92-94. The Office Action contends that figure 3 shows the lock body 11 having smooth, angled surfaces at its top. See page 3 of the Office Action. Even if the lock body 11 could be used as a lock for a pedestal closure, the lock body 11 has sharp edges that would snag cables. See figures 3 and 5. Moreover, Hollister is not even concerned with the lock body 11 snagging cables because the top of the lock body 11 is mounted directly to the plate P. Accordingly, Hollister does not disclose or suggest a slide lock assembly for a pedestal closure, where the slide lock assembly includes an outer surface configured to prevent snagging cables.

Mahaney discloses a lock assembly for preventing unauthorized opening of a utility meter box cover. The lock assembly is located external to the meter box and is designed to resist bending, prying or cutting. See figure 1 and column 4 lines 2-3. In contrast, and as discussed above, the lock assembly of the subject application is for a

pedestal closure and is located inside the pedestal closure. Since the lock assembly of Mahaney is located outside, it is not in the vicinity of any cables. Accordingly, Mahaney does not need or disclose or suggest an outer surface configured to prevent snagging cables.

Leininger discloses a system for securing the loading doors of trucks. This reference clearly does not relate in any way to pedestal closures and therefore does not disclose or suggest an outer surface configured to prevent snagging cables. Indeed, the Patent Office merely relies on Leininger for purportedly disclosing a drainage port. See page 3 of the Office Action.

Vickers discloses a multi-point latching system 10 adapted for mounting on a door and securing the door to a frame. The latching system 10 includes a central latch 20. See column 4 lines 46-47. As shown in figures 1, 2, 4 and 5, central latch 20 includes several sharp edges that would snag cables. Therefore, even if the latching system 10 could be used as a lock assembly for a pedestal closure, Vickers does not disclose or suggest an outer surface configured to prevent snagging cables. In fact, the Patent Office merely relies on Vickers for purportedly disclosing a hex head.

Yang discloses a door handle 1 for replacing a conventional rotatable doorknob. The door handle includes a transmission case 7 having two casing portions 7a and 7b. See column 2 lines 50-51. The Office Action contends that 7a represents a base. Even assuming, arguendo, that 7a is a base, Yang fails to disclose that the casing portion 7a is configured to prevent snagging cables because the casing portion 7a includes sharp edges that would snag cables. See figures 2A-B, 3A-B and 4C.

Dallmann discloses a latch 30 for connecting a sash of a double-hung window. The latch 30 includes a lever arm 34, an upper housing 36 and a lower housing 38. See column 3 lines 42-45. The Office Action contends that the lower housing 38 is a base. Even if the lower housing 38 is a base, it is not configured to prevent snagging cables because the lower housing 38 includes sharp edges that would snag cables. See figures 1, 2 and 3. Furthermore, Dallmann is not even concerned with snagging cables since the lower housing 38 is mounted directly on a vertical rail 10 of a sash 14.

Sullivan discloses a locking mechanism for securing the cover of a meter box. The locking mechanism includes a lock body 6 that is mounted external to the meter box. See figure 21. The lock body 6 is configured to restrict gripping and hammering by having angled and radiused surfaces. See column 5, lines 37-45. Similar to Mahaney, since the lock assembly of Sullivan is located outside, it is not in the vicinity of any cables. Accordingly Sullivan does not disclose or suggest an outer surface configured to prevent snagging cables.

Finally, Litvin also does not disclose an outer surface configured to prevent snagging cables. Instead, Litvin discloses a security lock for a door 1 comprising a housing having walls 4. See column 3 lines 29-35. The Office Action contends that the walls 4 represent a base. Again, even if the walls 4 represents a base, the base is not configured to prevent snagging cables because the wall include sharp edges that would snag cables. Furthermore, Litvin is not concerned with snagging cables since the entire lock is located inside the door 1. See figure 3.

For at least the reasons above, none of the references cited by the Patent Office recite a base having an outer surface configured to prevent snagging cables.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the § 103 rejection with respect to claims 1-3, 6, 14-15, 16 and 19 is improper and should be withdrawn.

NEW CLAIMS 24-38

By this Amendment, new claims 24-38 have been added. Claims 24-29 depend from claim 1 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. New independent claim 30 recites a pedestal closure assembly comprising, among other things, a dome having a lower portion, a base and a lock. The lock is positioned adjacent cables when the cables are installed and is configured to prevent snagging the cables. As indicated above with respect to claim 1, the art cited by the Patent Office fails to teach or suggest a lock configured to prevent snagging cables when the cables are installed in the pedestal closure. Thus, claim 30 should be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Because claims 31-38 depend from claim 30, such claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 30.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (314) 726-7500.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Michael J. Thomas, Reg. 39,857

Dated: 10-13-05

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
7700 Bonhomme, Suite 400
St. Louis, MO 63105
(314) 726-7500